

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 have been cancelled and new claims 23-44 have been added and are now pending in the present application. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the new claims and favorable action. Applicant also respectfully submits, for consideration by the Examiner, a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement to be filed on March 5, 2003 using the EPAVE system, which contains references uncovered in a search conducted in February 2003.

The cancelled claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 103(a) over Hutchins, and Hutchins in combination with Gould and Lucas. The new claims recite more specifically to limitations of the invention not found in any art of record. For example, in view of new claim 23, it may be seen that Hutchins (or Gould or Lucas) does not teach:

- receiving a digital data representation of speech comprising a stream of binary bits;
- grouping sets of the binary bits and mapping each set to a representation of a letter;
- grouping the representations of letters into words, the words being separated by a character representation of pause in the speech;
- determining the number of syllables in the digital data representation of the speech for a corresponding word; and
- searching a library containing a plurality of words according to the representations of letters and the number of syllables of each word, and providing a matched word in response thereto.

Hutchins, as shown in its FIGURE 4A, takes the digitizer output, analyzes its amplitude change, pitch dispersion, and raw phonetic estimates to break it into subsyllables (Col. 5, lines 40-44; Col. 7, lines 44-48). The subsyllables are characterized by "silence, frication, stable vowel, and change." (Col. 5, lines 50-52). The subsyllables and all combinations of subsyllable spelling are then evaluated and matched to a database, grammar process, and a "stored table of non-terminals" to produce a syllable. (Col. 9, lines 49-64). The syllables are then combined and

converted to words. (Col. 11, lines 27-30). Hutchins therefore builds the words from a phonetic recognition and analysis of subsyllables. This is very different from the teachings of the present invention, as set forth above in new independent claim 23, as well as new independent method claims 34 and 44. Gould and Lucas, either alone or in combination with Hutchins, also do not teach or suggest these limitations. Further, none of the references submitted in the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement teach or suggest the limitations in new claims 23, 34 and 44.

Dependent claims 24-33 and 35-43 depend respectively from claims 23 and 34. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims comprise additional limitations not found in any of the art of record.

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

Applicant encloses herewith a Petition for one-month extension and fee. The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment associated with this Response to Deposit Account No. 13-4900 of Munsch Hardt Kopf & Harr, P.C.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Wei Wei Jeang
Reg. No. 33,305

Date: March 4, 2003
Munsch Hardt Kopf & Harr, P.C.
4000 Fountain Place
1445 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75202-2793
Telephone: 214-855-7510
Facsimile: 214-978-4324

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, D.C. 20231 on the date indicated below.

Name

William R. Colum

Date

March 4, 2003